



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

their birth to secure equality of rights and therefore must rest on justice. With the success of the Allies it is not only fair to presume, but most probable, that there will be no menacing autocratic powers after the termination of the present war. The democratic nations will be preponderant and they will have learned the lesson to be vigilant, so that for the first time in history the leading powers of the world being democratic will be privileged to enter into a partnership that will give security, under a league of democracies, for the perpetuation of freedom and the equal rights of all its constituents, great and small. Under the domination of autocratic nations the international relationship of the world was in an anarchistic state. But under the league of democratic nations the international relationship of the world can and doubtless will be secured upon the broad and lasting foundation of international justice.

## A BASIS FOR A DURABLE PEACE BETWEEN GERMANY AND ENGLAND

BY WILLIAM C. BULLITT,  
Philadelphia.

I shall not attempt to deal with the problems of durable peace in general but shall try to concentrate attention on one of those zones of hostility and hatred in which a conflagration is likely to arise and to wreck a durable peace after it has apparently been made.

There are, of course, many such zones in the world. There is the zone in the Pacific where the interests of the United States and Japan conflict. There is the zone in the Balkans where the interests of Russia and Austria conflict; but I wish to call your attention to the zone in the North Sea, where the hatred of Germany and England concentrates. And I shall try to explain the source of that hatred and a method by which it may be eliminated.

I do not think that the hostility of Germany and England springs primarily from commercial and industrial rivalry. I do not think that England's hatred of Germany springs primarily from her wrath at the violation of Belgium and the atrocities com-

mitted in Belgium and France. I do not think it springs from envy of the growth of Germany's power in the past decade. I do not think that Germany's hatred of England springs primarily from envy of the vast British Colonial Empire or from the belief which is widespread in Germany, unbelievable as it may seem on this side of the water, that England started and organized the present war.

None of these things, to my mind, is at the bottom of the hostility between Germany and England. It lies much deeper; in the thing which is usually at the bottom of a great hatred—fear. Fear on the part of Germany, that the British fleet will starve her to death; fear, on the part of England, that the German submarines will starve her to death.

How legitimate are these fears is shown vividly by the condition of affairs in both those countries today—Germany on the verge of starvation; England afraid that in six months, if the submarine campaign goes on, she will be on the verge of starvation. But these fears are not simply things of today. They are inherent in the economic life and geographical position of those two great industrial nations, cooped together in the same corner of Europe.

Germany, today, scarcely less than England, is dependent upon the sea for her life. She has ceased to produce enough food to support her people. She may be able to live through the present war with closed frontiers, but her agriculture has already been raised to a very high state of development. It is not susceptible of much greater development, and with her normal increase of population in ten years she will be utterly unable to live with closed frontiers. Her life will be in the gun muzzles of the British fleet. Moreover, she earns her livelihood largely by importing raw materials, turning them into finished products, and exporting the finished products, and for this entire process she must have security on the sea. Furthermore, the fear that she will be cut off by the British fleet from her supplies of food and raw products is kept constantly in front of her by the fact that every German ship that goes to the ocean must pass by the door of England. Her ships can reach the open ocean only by way of the Channel or the North Sea, which is in truth but another channel, varying from three to four hundred miles in width, which can be controlled almost as easily by the fleet based on the Orkneys as the Channel is controlled by the fleet based on Portsmouth.

I don't think you can realize unless you have gone to bed hungry in Berlin during the war, how intensely every class in Germany, from the top of the Foreign Office to the end of the minority Socialist party, is determined that in some way there must come out of this war something which will eliminate the danger of being cut off from overseas supplies.

The German Conservatives have their solution. They say, "All we have to do is to build a bigger fleet than England or simply destroy England altogether." Fortunately, that is more easily dreamed than accomplished. For until England is willing to commit suicide, she will retain her present naval supremacy. She lives partly on her banking, to be sure, but vitally on the earnings of her shipping, on her imports of raw products, on her exports of finished products. Furthermore, her relationship with her colonies imposes on her the obligation of defending them, and this she accomplishes, not by maintaining fleets in their waters, but by a concentration of force in the North Sea, which is at once the base of defense and attack for the whole world.

But this very supremacy in the North Sea, which England must maintain, means a perpetual latent control of German commerce. This is the vicious circle of fear which produces the hatred and enmity between England and Germany. So long as the fleets of each threaten the merchantmen of the other, so long will there be fear and hatred and war between them.

The President of the United States perceived this a long time ago, and in January, 1915, in order to attempt to reconcile Germany and England, he sent an emissary to both those countries to propose what I consider one of the wisest plans that has ever been put forward by the great man, for I believe he, who is our President, is a great man.

The emissary of the President was ordered to propose that Germany and England and all the other nations in the world should agree that even in time of war, all merchantmen, both belligerent and neutral, should be unhindered in their passage except when carrying contraband, and that contraband should be confined strictly to munitions of war. This would mean that even in time of war the merchantmen of England and Germany would come unhindered into port, that there would be no starvation of civilian populations, that there would be no threat of such starvation.

And I believe that it would mean that the fear which is at the bottom of the hostility between those nations would be eliminated and that in time, perhaps a decade or two, their mutual interest in the peaceful development of the undeveloped portions of the earth would lead to their coöperation and ultimately to their friendship.

The leaders of the German army and navy and of the Conservative parties met the President's proposal with a most emphatic "No!" They said, "We will not give up our great offensive weapon, the submarine, by which some day we shall be able to starve England into submission." But on the other hand, the Socialists, the Radicals, and Von Jagow, who was at that time the head of the Foreign Office, assented to the President's proposal. They said, "We are willing to agree to give up our weapon of offense if we can make sure that we shall never have to suffer again the food shortage which is sucking the blood of our children, our wives and our parents." And although these men are not in control of Germany today, there has been every indication in the past few months that they will be in control of Germany when the war closes, and I believe that in the peace conference Germany will stand firmly behind the President's proposal.

When the President's emissary reached England, he met almost exactly the same reception as in Germany. The Conservatives said, "No, never! We will never give up the means by which we killed Napoleon, by which we are killing Germany today. We will never give up the commercial blockade!" But the labor leaders, the Socialists, and particularly the group of Liberals led by Lord Loreburn, accepted the suggestion, and Sir Edward Grey himself was inclined very strongly in that direction. Then the sinking of the *Lusitania* killed all hope of immediate reconciliation between Germany and England; and the subsequent career of the President's proposal I have not time to trace.

But the fact is that when the peace conference comes, the President's proposal will again be pushed by the representative of the United States. And I believe that England can be brought to back this proposal, although the sentiment there today, I imagine, would be against it. I believe that she will accept it ultimately for the reason that the submarine in the next six months will bring home to her what it means to fear starvation, what it means to be afraid that not only yourself, but also your children and your parents will not have food.

Furthermore, it has come to be generally recognized in the British Foreign Office, that England has been able to carry out her blockade of Germany, not merely because of her fleet, but also because we have been willing to acquiesce in that blockade because we believe, on the whole, that her cause has been just and that her triumph will be to the interest of the whole world. Furthermore, England knows that the submarine is still a relatively undeveloped weapon, and that no one can tell how fatal to merchant shipping the super-submarine of the future may become.

I therefore believe, that if the President has the united support of America on this proposition, it will go through, particularly in view of a recent addition which the government has made to it. The addition is this: that although the right to stop merchantmen in time of war should be taken away from any individual state, it should be reserved to all the nations of the world acting collectively through the League to Enforce Peace. In other words, the league would carry the pistol which would be denied to any individual state. This addition will remove the chief objection of the British Conservatives; which is that the German army, if this plan should be adopted, would dictate the course of events in Europe; for the League to Enforce Peace would hold in its hands a counterpoise to balance the power of the German army.

It is, I believe, the duty of all Americans who are interested in a durable peace to back the President in this proposal, because I see no other way whereby the hatred between Germany and England can be abolished, and unless that hatred can be done away with, unless the roots of it can be cut, while the League to Enforce Peace may prolong peace, it will never establish a peace which can be considered durable.

Furthermore, if this proposal should be adopted, if the starvation of civilian populations should be taken out of war, a great step forward will have been made in the establishment of decent international *mores*. And after all, we are entering this war for one purpose and one only—that better international *mores* may be established on the earth.